DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 067 067 HE 003 438

AUTHOR	Blake, Elias, Jr.
TITLE	Graduating Seniors Look Back at Their Freshman Year in College.
INSTITUTION	Institute for Services to Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Division of Higher Education Research, NCERD.
PUB DATE	Apr 72
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-070867
NOTE	22p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Evaluation; *Higher Education; *Minority Groups; Negro Colleges; *Negro Education; Negro Students; *Relevance (Education); Statistical Data

ABSTRACT

The data in this report came from a questionnaire administered to 2,448 graduating seniors at 13 predominantly black colleges. The basic goal was to determine if there were any differences in the perceptions of graduating seniors who had been enrolled in the Thirteen-College Curriculum Program (TCCP) and those who had not. TCCP is a program designed to deal with the particular problems of black students. A detailed questionnaire called for the following types of administration: background-demographic data; post-graduate plans and aspirations; attitudes toward attending a black college; financial patterns for paying college expenses; perceptions of the impact of the freshman year; perceptions of college classroom environment by year; self-concept ratings; opinions of the organization of higher education with some emphasis on student participation. Results indicate that students enrolled in TCCP were engaged in a unique educational experience that encouraged students from lower-than-normal income levels to continue their educations. (Author/CS)

ED 067067

INSTITUTE FOR SERVICES
TO EDUCATION

RESEARCH REPORT

GRADUATING SENIORS LOOK BACK AT THEIR FRESHMAN YEAR IN COLLEGE

Comparison of TCCP and Non-TCCP Graduating Seniors on Their Perceptions of Their Freshmen Instruction

ELIAS BLAKE, JR.
President

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INSTITUTE FOR SERVICES TO EDUCATION, INC.
2001 S STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009

HE 003 458

The research reported herein was supported in part by USOE Contract No. OEC 0-8-070867, Division of Higher Education Research.

ED 067067

GRADUATING SENIORS LOOK BACK

AT THEIR FRESHMAN YEAR IN COLLEGE

Thirteen-College Curriculum Program
Preliminary Research Report--

Comparison of TCCP and Non-TCCP Graduating Seniors
On Their Perceptions of Their Freshmen Instruction

Elias Blake, Jr.
President

Institute for Services to Education, Inc.
2001 S Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20009

1st printing: December 1971
2nd printing: April 1972

CONTENTS

About the Institute for Services to Education v

Introduction. ix

Some Preliminary Results From an Exit Questionnaire Given to Graduating Seniors, May 1971 1

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE I: College Attrition: Program Students and a Random Sample of Regular Students, Entering TCCP, Fall, 1967 xiii

TABLE II: Comparative Grade-Point Averages: Program Students and Regular Students Entering the Senior Year xv

ABOUT THE INSTITUTE FOR SERVICES TO EDUCATION

The Institute for Services to Education was incorporated as a non-profit organization in 1965 and received a basic grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The organization is founded on the principle that education today requires a fresh examination of what is worth teaching and how to teach it. ISE undertakes a variety of educational tasks working cooperatively with other educational institutions, under grants from government agencies and private foundations. ISE is a catalyst for change. It does not just produce educational materials or techniques that are innovative; it develops, in-cooperation with teachers and administrators, procedures for effective installation of successful materials and techniques in the colleges.

ISE is headed by Dr. Elias Blake, Jr., a former teacher and is staffed by college teachers with experience in working with disadvantaged youth and black youth in educational settings both in predominantly Black and predominantly white colleges and schools.

ISE's Board of Directors consists of persons in the higher education system with histories of involvement in curriculum change. TheBoard members are:

Vernon Alden	Chairman of the Board, The Boston Company, Boston, Massachusetts
Herman Branson	President, Lincoln University
Kingman Brewster, Jr.	President, Yale Universitty
Donald Brown	The Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, University of Michigan
Arthur P. Davis	Graduate Professor in English, Howard University
Carl J. Dolce	Dean, School of Education, North Carolina State University
Vivian Henderson	President, Clark College
Martin Jenkins	Director, Urban Affairs, ACE
Samuel Nabrit (Chairman)	Executive Director, Southern Fellowship Fund, Atlanta, Georgia
Arthur Singer	Vice-President, Sloan Foundation, New York, New York
Otis Singletary	President, University of Kentucky
C. Vann Woodward	Professor of History, Yale University
Stephen Wright	Vice-President of the Board, CEEB
Jerrold Zacharias	Professor of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

ABOUT THE THIRTEEN COLLEGE CURRICULUM PROGRAM

From 1967 to the present, ISE has been working cooperatively with the Thirteen-College Consortium in developing the Thirteen-College Curriculum Program. The Thirteen-College Curriculum Program is an educational experiment that includes developing new curricular materials for the entire freshman year of college in the areas of English, mathematics, social science, physical science, and biology, and two sophomore year courses, humanities and philosophy. The program is designed to reduce the attrition rate of entering freshmen through well thought-out, new curricular materials, new teaching styles, and new faculty arrangements for instruction. In addition, the program seeks to alter the educational pattern of the institutions involved by changing blocks of courses rather than by developing single courses. In this sense, the Thirteen-College Curriculum Program is viewed not only as a curriculum program with a consistent set of academic goals for the separate courses, but also as a vehicle to produce new and pertinent educational changes within the consortium institutions. At ISE, the program is directed by Dr. Frederick S. Humphries, Vice-President. The curricular developments for the specific courses of the program are provided by the following persons:

Course	ISE Staff
English	Mr. Sloan Williams, Senior Program Associate
	Mrs. Eleanor Murrell, Program Associate
	Mrs. Carolyn Fichett Bins, Program Associate
Social Science	Dr. George King, Senior Program Associate
Mathematics	Mr. Bernis Barnes, Senior Program Associate
	Dr. Phillip E. McNeil, Program Associate
Physical Science	Dr. Leroy Colquitt, Senior Program Associate
	Dr. Roosevelt Calbert, Program Associate
Biology	Dr. Charles Goolsby, Senior Program Associate
	Dr. Dan Obasun, Program Associate
Humanities	Mr. Clifford Johnson, Senior Program Associate
	Mr. Roger Dickerson, Program Associate
	Mr. Keopapetse Kgositsile, Program Associate
Philosophy	Dr. Conrad Snowden, Senior Program Associate
	Dr. Henry Olela, Program Associate
Evaluation	Dr. Thomas Parmeter, Senior Research Associate
	Dr. Joseph Turner, Senior Research Associate

The curriculum staff is assisted in the generation of new educational ideas and teaching strategies by teachers in the participating colleges and outside consultants. Each of the curriculum areas has its own advisory committee, with members drawn from distinguished scholars in the field but outside the program.

The number of colleges participating in the program has grown from the original thirteen of 1967 to twenty-seven in 1971. The original thirteen colleges are:

Alabama A and M University	Huntsville, Alabama
Bennett College	Greensboro, North Carolina
Bishop College	Dallas, Texas
Clark College	Atlanta, Georgia
Florida A and M University	Tallahassee, Florida
Jackson State College	Jackson, Mississippi
Lincoln University	Lincoln University, Pennsylvania
Norfolk State College	Norfolk, Virginia
North Carolina A and T State University	Greensboro, North Carolina
Southern University	Baton Rouge, Louisiana
Talladega College	Talladega, Alabama
Tennessee State University	Nashville, Tennessee
Voorhees College	Denmark, South Carolina

A fourteenth college joined this consortium in 1968, although it is still called the Thirteen-College Consortium. The fourteenth member is

Mary Holmes Junior College	West Point, Mississippi

In 1971 a Five-College Consortium and a Eight-College Consortium joined the effort although linking up as separate consortiums. The members of the Five-College Consortium, including a sixth college added later, are:

Elizabeth City State University	Elizabeth City, North Carolina
Langston University	Langston, Oklahoma
Southern University at Shreveport	Shreveport, Louisiana
Saint Augustine's College	Raleigh, North Carolina
Texas Southern University	Houston, Texas
Fayetteville State University	Fayetteville, North Carolina

The members of the Eight-College Consortium are:

Grambling College	Grambling, Louisiana
Alcorn A and M College	Lorman, Mississippi
Bethune Cookman	Daytona Beach Florida
Jarvis Christian College	Hawkins, Texas
LeMoyne Owen	Memphis, Tennessee
Southern University	New Orleans, Louisiana
University of Maryland Eastern Shore	Princess Anne, Maryland
Virginia Union University	Richmond, Virginia

ISE is presently increasing the number of schools involved in the effort by adding another consortium some time in the near future.

The Thirteen-College Curriculum Program has been supported by grants from:

The Office of Education, Title III, Division of College Support
The Office of Education, Bureau of Research
The National Science Foundation, Division of the Undergraduate Education
The Ford Foundation
The Carnegie Corporation
The ESSO Foundation

INTRODUCTION

The attached data came from a questionnaire administered to 2,448 graduating seniors at thirteen predominantly black colleges. The basic goal was to determine if there were any differences in the perceptions of graduating seniors who had been enrolled in the THIRTEEN-COLLEGE CURRICULUM PROGRAM (TCCP) and those who had not. A rather detailed questionnaire included the following kinds of information.

1. Background-demographic data including racial composition of high school, socioeconomic status, housing patterns, working patterns;

2. Post-graduate plans and aspirations;

3. Attitudes toward attending a black college;

4. Participation and leadership patterns;

5. Financial patterns for paying college expenses;

6. Perceptions of the impact of the freshman year;

7. Perceptions of college classroom environment by years, freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior years combined, including:

   a. student behavior in classes
   b. grading practices
   c. teacher behavior
   d. course organization and approaches
   e. view of relevancy and relationship to the black experience

8. Self-concept ratings in general intellectual traits as well as specific subject areas and traits such as leadership and conformity;

9. Opinions on the organization of higher education with some emphasis on student participation.

Why This Short Report

We will issue a series of longer reports but of manageable size dealing with the various areas. The job of analysis and interpretation is a complex and time consuming one. Colleges in the Thirteen-College Consortium and the Five-College Consortium are now heavily involved in trying to institutionalize all or major parts of the experimental freshman year as the official freshman curriculum of their institutions. Institutional change is a tough, difficult business and change agents are always asked why change? For that reason we looked at some of the more salient results from the areas of aspirations, participation and instructional environment for immediate release. We selected results which are mostly self-explanatory. Greater detail in terms of interpretation will come in later reports.

Report Limits

This report is limited to perceptions of their freshman year by three groups of students. It focuses on those perceptions which seem to define clear differences in the TCCP versus other methods of instruction. The differences support the verbal descriptions of the inputs of the program into teacher behavior and general approaches to teaching. Clearly, the TCCP students were in a different educational experience and the attrition data relate to some positive outputs in terms of keeping more students from even lower than normal income levels in college.

Related Future Results

Another result is that, as TCCP students moved up toward graduation, their perceptions progressively became like those of their peers. This was to be expected because after the sophomore year when one-half of their program was in the TCCP, they were completely in programs identical to those of their peers. If anything, TCCP students were slightly more critical of what are fairly standard instructional practices than their peers. This may mean that, through the freshman year experience, they gained some new standards of what education should be. Those data will be reported in a fuller exposition. But, for an example, on the following items: "The primary form of classroom instruction is the lecture." The responses showed the following pattern as perceived by the graduating seniors.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2	
generally true	35.1%	89.1%	90.3%	freshman year
generally false	62.7%	5.5%	7.0%	
generally true	52.2%	86.9%	87.7%	sophomore year*
generally false	45.0%	7.1%	8.5%	
generally true	82.0%	71.4%	77.8%	junior and senior years
generally false	14.3%	22.1%	18.4%	

* One-half of work still in TCCP courses; one-half in standard curriculum.

Or on another item: "courses emphasized doing things rather than just listening to the teacher."

	TCCP	C-1	C-2	
generally true	82.3%	44.0%	50.3%	freshman year
generally false	13.8%	48.1%	44.4%	
generally true	72.5%	47.4%	53.6%	sophomore year
generally false	22.6%	44.5%	40.7%	
generally true	49.0%	59.0%	65.8%	junior and senior years
generally false	45.9%	33.0%	29.0%	

The two items indicate how the perceptions of the TCCP students were moving in an opposite direction from those of their peers in regards to the amount of lecturing and more active participation versus just listening. In the junior and senior years, the TCCP students perceive more lecturing and less active participation than their peers.

The fuller reports will give a full profile as well as by school analyses, with no identification of institutions. We believe, however, this short preliminary report will be of immediate value in helping describe empirically what it is the TCCP purports to try to do in terms of teaching and learning.

Elias Blake, Jr.
President, ISE
December, 1971

TABLE I

College Attrition: Program Students and a Random Sample of Regular Students, Entering TCCP, Fall, 1967

		Freshman Year		Sophomore Year		Junior Year		Senior Year
		Entering	Withdraw	Entering	Withdraw	Entering	Withdraw	Entering
Program	Number	1179	168	1011	201	810	73	737
	Withdrawal (%)*		14.2%		19.9%		9%	
	Continuing (%)	100%		85.8%		68.7%		62.5%
Regular	Number	839**	248	591	155	436	42	394
	Withdrawal (%)*		29.6%		26.2%		9.6%	
	Continuing (%)	100%		70.4%		51.9%		46.9%***

* Based upon the number continuing for each year independently

** ISE collected entering data on more than 2000 regular college students; a 33 percent stratified (by college) random sample was then collected for continuing assessment purposes.

TABLE II

Comparative Grade-Point Averages: Program Students and Regular Students Entering the Senior Year

Continuing Grade-Point-Averages#

		Freshman Year 1st Term**	Freshman Year 2nd Term**	Freshman Year Total**	Soph. Year Program Courses	Soph. Year New-Program Courses*	Cumulative For Program Courses	Cumulative Through Soph. Year**	Junior Year Total	Cumulative Through Junior Year**
Program N=716	Mean	2.55	2.56	2.55	2.58	2.38	2.55	2.50	2.41	2.49
	S.D.	.61	.64	.61	.69	.68	.58	.54	.69	.53
Regular N=379	Mean	2.14	2.19	2.16	----	2.33	----	2.29	2.41	2.36
	S.D.	.68	.70	.61	----	.56	----	.49	.64	.48

A Four-Point Scale (A=4.00)
* Significant difference at less than .05
** Significant difference at less than .01
*** A poll of administrators suggests this is an overestimate. We have discovered serious problems in the verification of the 839 students as being identical through four years due to record keeping in some colleges. Some people different from the original 839 flowing into the sample may have inflated the percentage. A study of transcripts will clear up this problem.

SOME PRELIMINARY RESULTS
FROM AN EXIT QUESTIONNAIRE GIVEN TO GRADUATING SENIORS
May, 1971

Basis: Exit Questionnaire (available from ISE) to 2,448 graduating students across thirteen black colleges. All following descriptions apply to the data across all schools.

Significant Groups in the Data: (all possible subjects did not take the questionnaire)

TCCP — N=327 1971 graduating seniors enrolled in 1967-68 in the experimental freshmen year (out of 737 who were enrolled as seniors, see Tables I and II).

Control 1 (C-1) — N=312 1971 graduating seniors selected as controls in 1967-68 to follow through college (of a sample of 394 who were enrolled as seniors, see Tables I and II).

Control 2 (C-2) — N=1,809 1971 graduating seniors, 81% of whom entered and completed their work in the same institutions as the TCCP and C-1 groups above. The major difference is that 34% of this group took five or more years to graduate.

I. Based on their economic background, what kind of students survived to graduate?

The TCCP started out with a greater proportion of poorer students, though their academic aptitude was no different as based on the American College Tests.

	$3,000 or less	$3,000 4,999	$5,000 7,499	$7,500 10,000	$10,000 +
TCCP N=327	*32.5%	35.5%	22.6%	4.9%	1.5%
C-1 N=312	17.0%	25.7%	25.9%	14.7%	13.5%
C-2 N=1,809	18.4%	25.5%	27.5%	12.1%	12.1%

Clearly the program did not make an input of poorer students who disappeared leaving the actual graduates more like their entering controls. They persevered to graduate after the special freshman year.

* Percentages total slightly less than 100% due to no response item. Unless indicated as otherwise, all these results show a significant chi-square $P < .001$ for the difference presented.

II. Are there any motivation or aspiration differences?

Of the students who were freshmen in the TCCP, more men aspire to become doctors and lawyers and to go onto graduate school than in the two control groups. Among women graduates, the only area of greater aspiration to graduate or professional training was in the law. More men and women aspire to graduate school at the end of four years of college.

Men Respondents

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
Medicine	10.3%	4.2%	3.0%
Law	14.4%	5.2%	5.0%
Ph.D.	17.5%	16.7%	20.2%

In being asked about plans immediately following graduation, more TCCP students aspire to go right into graduate school.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
Men	33.0%	17.7%	21.9%
Women	27.4%	19.9%	16.5%
Total	29.1%	19.2%	18.7%

While in college, the TCCP male students appear to be more involved in leadership roles than the controls. Almost twice as many men were elected president of a student organization;

*TCCP	C-1	C-2
20.0%	10.4%	13.2%

elected to any office while a student.

33.0%	22.9%	18.3%

The kinds of results presented so far seem to suggest that not only can more heavily economically disadvantaged youth be enrolled, but their motivational patterns can be affected. From preliminary examination, this is a consistent pattern in areas of participation and in aspirations.

III. Was there a significantly different instructional program being offered which involved a "new style of teaching" or were there any differences in teacher behavior perceived by students in this experimental freshman year?

* Chi-square P = .08

There were four responses: generally true
more true than false
more false than true
generally false

The responses have been simplified and combined to generally/mostly true and generally/mostly false. The graduating seniors made the following responses about their freshman year classroom experiences after three additional years of successful college work from which to make their observations.

A. The primary form of classroom instruction was the lecture (during my freshman year).

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally/mostly true	35.1%	89.1%	90.3%
generally/mostly false	62.7%	5.5%	7.0%

B. Students were encouraged to solve problems in their own way rather than look to teachers or textbooks for answers (during my freshman year).

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally/mostly true	74.4%	48.1%	48.5%
generally/mostly false	20.9%	46.8%	47.5%

C. Classroom discussion (was) aimed at answering a teacher's question rather than introducing a new idea or defending a point of view.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally/mostly true	36.4%	61.9%	65.5%
generally/mostly false	60.2%	33.9%	30.7%

D. Courses emphasized students doing things rather than just listening to the teacher.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally/mostly true	82.3%	44.0%	50.3%
generally/mostly false	13.8%	48.1%	44.4%

E. Courses reward conformity and discourage creativity.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally/mostly true	21.0%	40.0%	45.8%
generally/mostly false	70.3%	52.9%	46.5%

F. Teachers resented students for challenging a favored point of view.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally/mostly true	15.3%	40.4%	42.9%
generally/mostly false	80.4%	51.3%	53.6%

G. There was only one way to learn, the teacher's way.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally/mostly true	23.9%	55.4%	56.9%
generally/mostly false	71.8%	35.6%	37.8%

H. Faculty members experimented with new methods of teaching.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally/mostly true	78.7%	31.0%	35.8%
generally/mostly false	16.1%	63.9%	60.5%

Chi-square analyses of these results are being analyzed. In these results, preliminary interpretations indicate significant differences.

The clear trend is that there were in effect more attempts to avoid passive forms of learning such as listening to lectures; there was more discussion aimed at new ideas versus answering teachers' questions; more active learning experiences than listening to the teacher; creativity was rewarded much more; teachers were more open to intellectual challenges and more flexible about learning styles in the classroom. Item H is a kind of summary indicating that students having completed twelve years of elementary and secondary school and four years of college viewed their freshman year as involving new methods of teaching. These are impressive tentative results.

IV. How did the students perceive the quality and impact of this different style of teaching in their freshman year?

A. The courses were an intellectual challenge.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally/mostly true	78.9%	59.3%	61.1%
generally/mostly false	17.3%	32.4%	32.9%

B. Students learned a lot in their courses.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally/mostly true	79.8%	52.5%	55.6%
generally/mostly false	12.9%	38.5%	37.5%

C. Students felt the quality of instruction was very good.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally/mostly true	76.1%	42.2%	48.7%
generally/mostly false	16.5%	46.2%	44.2%

D. Classroom discussions would continue among students after class.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally/mostly true	77.4%	52.6%	53.8%
generally/mostly false	17.4%	40.4%	41.6%

The TCCP students then perceived this "new style" as substantive and of higher intellectual quality as opposed to weak courses to a greater degree than students in the other classes in their freshman year. In addition, when asked if courses taken "during my freshman year" contributed significantly to how I think about things <u>today</u>, there were the following responses.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally/mostly true	70.4%	40.8%	46.2%
generally/mostly false	25.9%	49.6%	49.1%

The responses to the same item for courses taken during their junior and senior years follow:

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally/mostly true	50.8%	56.4%	61.8%
generally/mostly false	44.3%	34.0%	32.5%

As we see, the control groups increased their perception of the significant impact of the upper level courses on their thinking today (at the end of college) while fewer of the TCCP students did so. In terms of the new standards set by their freshman year, TCCP students judged the upper level courses more harshly.

V. Were there, in fact, different organizational and content factors in the materials and approaches used in the courses?

Some factors which were different to some degree are illustrated below. The sharp differences in the way instruction was organized are better illustrated by reporting the results in a bit more detail. The generally true and mostly true responses are separated.

A. In English or related courses, students performed dramatics (excerpts from plays, dramatization of fiction, improvisational theater, poetry reading) in addition to writing book reports.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally true	62.1%	18.9%	20.1%
more true than false	23.5%	24.4%	21.8%
generally/mostly false	11.9%	49.3%	52.5%

B. In Social Science or related courses, students conducted own research projects (using questionnaires or interviews) on campus or in community in addition to writing library papers.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally true	49.8%	19.9%	18.0%
more true than false	22.0%	23.1%	24.5%
generally/mostly false	24.2%	48.4%	52.3%

C. In Mathematics, students used physical equipment (geo-boards, Instant Insanity and other games, colored cubes and chips, computers) in addition to paper and pencil (and slide rules and rulers).

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally true	60.6%	16.7%	16.2%
more true than false	19.0%	19.9%	20.7%
generally/mostly false	17.7%	55.5%	58.1%

D. In Physical Science or related courses, students had laboratory space and equipment to conduct experiments illustrating material in the course.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally true	63.0%	37.2%	35.0%
more true than false	20.8%	33.3%	31.1%
generally/mostly false	12.6%	21.4%	27.3%

E. In Biological Science or related courses, students had laboratory space and equipment to conduct experiments illustrating material in the course.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally true	67.6%	42.3%	42.5%
more true than false	20.8%	33.3%	31.3%
generally/mostly false	8.2%	16.7%	20.2%

In English, Mathematics, and Social Science, the sharp differences in responses on a course by course basis indicate something of the meaning of earlier responses about activity and non-lecturing. As one would expect in English and Mathematics where traditionally classroom activity is in a rather narrow range, the differences are sharpest.

In the Science courses, which are normally in laboratory settings, a heavier use of lab techniques is reflected in all courses.

F. Teachers used such things as sound films, film loops, tapes, records, slides, overhead projectors, or film strips in addition to readings.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally true	64.8%	27.2%	28.9%
more true than false	20.2%	22.8%	23.7%
generally/mostly false	12.5%	43.6%	43.6%

Again in the above item, one sees a further definition of what teachers were doing differently in the organization of their courses, with almost all of the TCCP students in experiences with a susbstantial use of audio-visual aids versus the traditional lecture.

G. Teachers encouraged students to criticize course materials and teaching methods.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally true	69.1%	32.4%	34.1%
generally/mostly false	26.5%	59.7%	61.2%

The willingness of a teacher to open his or her class to student criticism is rare, yet almost 70% of the TCCP students see this as true of their classes versus about a third of the two control groups. Clearly "openess" was taking on some meaning in teacher behavior as perceived by students.

VI. The issue of relevancy is much bandied about these days. And with predominantly black enrollments in a college, relevancy would mean concern for the special problems which black students will have to confront as a black minority in a predominantly white society.

A. Teachers made the courses relevant to contemporary issues such as those that affect black people and poor people in America (during my freshman year).

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally/mostly true	86.5%	41.0%	41.1%
generally/mostly false	20.5%	50.9%	54.5%

B. Teachers made courses relevant to the black experience.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally/mostly true	70.5%	32.9%	35.1%
generally/mostly false	23.9%	58.8%	58.5%

C. Books, articles by and about black people given a prominent place in your English or related courses.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally/mostly true	80.8%	42.9%	47.8%
generally/mostly false	13.8%	49.3%	46.1%

D. Books, articles by and about black people given a prominent place in your Social Science or related courses.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally/mostly true	78.9%	42.3%	45.9%
generally/mostly false	15.6%	50.7%	48.0%

E. Looked at art or listened to music by and about black people in English, humanities, or art and music appreciation courses.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally/mostly true	84.4%	43.9%	45.9%
generally/mostly false	11.1%	48.7%	47.8%

F. Some courses included jazz, blues, gospel music right along with classical music.

	TCCP	C-1	C-2
generally/mostly true	66.5%	38.4%	44.5%
generally/mostly false	24.3%	50.0%	47.0%

A parenthetical comment might be that these freshman courses were in 1967 which pre-dated the heavy surge toward black studies. These, however, are not black studies classes but general education courses which include these materials as an integral part of a wide range of materials. Though these are some of the most striking differences, a significant amount of black-related materials were in use by teachers not involved in the TCCP but nowhere near the consistency level.

Overall, these preliminary data point toward the specific qualities of the TCCP instructional strategies that may be responsible for the students staying in college longer and graduating in larger numbers. In a sense, these questions ask in detail the kinds of statements suggested in the draft progess report (November, 1971) as salient traits of the program. Even with new kinds of content or old content organized differently or smaller classes, there is always the question of whether these things result in anything being done differently. The questionnaire data indicate clearly that the instruction by teachers more open to criticism, to a greater variety of ways of learning, to problem solving by students independent of them, to use of materials related to the lives and experiences of their students was much more than rhetoric; it was perceived as reality by a greater proportion of graduating seniors (almost twice as many in a number of items) from the TCCP than from other kinds of freshman year programs.

It appears that the TCCP is, in effect, bringing together divergent aspects of good teaching and good materials and concentrating or focusing them on a disadvantaged population. On the reverse side, these data indicate how firmly lecturing and generally passive learning environments are entrenched. (Lecture as the primary form of teaching was called a mostly true statement by almost 90% of the non-TCCP graduating seniors in their freshman and sophomore years and over 75% of all three groups, including the TCCP graduating seniors in their junior and senior years. In effect, only 35% of TCCP seniors viewed the lecture as the primary form of teaching in their freshman year while 82% of the same students viewed it as the primary form of teaching in the junior and senior years.)

It appears that without some kind of intervention focusing on a wider range of teaching strategies, changes in materials and in class sizes and organizations are not going to effectively produce any significant changes in instructional programs.

Given the history of the predominantly black colleges in serving these kinds of students, it is not surprising that on most items about half of the teachers are using similar instructional practices. An open question is what is the effect of the more passive teacher dominanted approaches on students

who from earlier surveys showed real weaknesses in terms of self-confidence in their intellectual capabilities or belief that they could learn. These results also mean that there are a good many allies already pursuing similar instructional goals and styles of teaching on these campuses (though a considerable number are not). With some astute on-campus appraisals, those of similar persuasion might make a critical mass for swinging the program into a different style. It was always the hypothesis that students, especially black students, needed a learning environment with more supports for self-initiated, problem solving activities. Their need to reach their personal and collective goals in a resistant society requires more challenging, more creativity, and active involvement than is needed for more favored non-black students.

The most profound question is what would a class of graduates be like if most of their four years were in the pattern they describe for their freshman year? These are signs that some institutions are interested in finding out.

EPILOGUE

The patterns of instruction in these predominantly black colleges are no different from any other group of colleges. Any survey of the literature on college teaching practices will bear this out. In fact, the pressures from students seeking different and more open styles of education are forcing a major re-evaluation of the patterns of teaching and learning in even the most prestigious colleges and universities. Thus, we categorically reject any interpretation which suggests anything unusual or different about the practices students perceived in their regular classes. The directions in which we are pushing for change are, therefore, applicable to any group of colleges.

In a particular case, it would be interesting to see if black and white students in predominantly white institutions viewed almost half their teachers as using as many audio-visual devices as in the case in Item F on page 7. From the items under the general Title of "relevancy" and dealing with the black experience, we suspect these schools, even without the TCCP, are doing a more systematic job with black students.

It is unlikely that over 40 percent of the students, black or non-black, under instruction of predominantly white faculties perceive as much content about contemporary issues and black people. In effect, we see in these data one probable reason why the movement toward black and Afro-American studies content is not as intense on predominantly black campuses or produce so much tension and hostility in the campus community. The materials are there in regular classes to a large extent in this sample of schools. It may be that the regular program reflects the presence and impact of the experimental freshman year program. In the writer's judgment, even on campuses where the TCCP does not exist, teachers deal more often with topics out of the lives and experiences of their students.

These data, then, only indicate <u>that</u> more can be done to have more students in black colleges survive to graduation, not that little or nothing was and is being done independent of the initiatives of the TCCP. The implication is that, if an entire faculty will embrace some of these directions, even more progress may be made in the future.